

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

26 September 1978

AM

10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

ADMINISTRATION

- A. Dates of next meetings: 24 October 1978
28 November 1978
- B. Minutes of August 1978 meeting.
- C. General Services Administration Master Plan of Federal Triangle, Old Post office Area, report.
- D. District of Columbia, Proposed Landmarks Legislation, report.
- E. Arlington County Height Limits, report.
- F. Personnel Announcements: Resignation of Sibley Jennings; Introduction of Elizabeth Bemis.

SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

- A. General Services Administration
J. Edgar Hoover Building,
Proposed Sculpture for Courtyard;
design development.
- B. Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division,
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
"Power Plant Fuel Storage Facility,
Washington Navy Yard."
- C. Department of the Army
"Memorial Plaque, Armed Forces, Vietnam Conflict."

26 September 1978

E. D.C. Department of Licenses, Investigations and Inspections

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 78-153, 901 34th Street, N.W.,
Apartment/Townhouse Complex.
2. O.G. 78-154, 1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.,
Commercial Building.
3. O.G. 78-157, 3045 K Street, N.W.,
raze commercial building.
4. O.G. 78-162, 1050 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.,
New Office Building - Resubmission.
5. Appendix 1.

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. Design for Fifteenth Street, N.W. between F and G
Streets, block including Kieth's Theater/Albee
Building, Metropolitan Bank Building, and Rhodes
Tavern.
2. Appendix 2.

SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

A. General Services Administration; Public Buildings Service,
Region 3

"White House Solar Heating installation designs."

26 September 1978

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
OG 78-		
141	1304 36th Street, N.W. Michael J. Pucillo	Replace existing wooden front stoop with brick stoop with wrought iron railings on both sides.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	
143	3800 Reservoir Road, N.W. Georgetown University	Retaining wall and rip-rap to sustain graded bank at new hospital parking garage.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	
144	1010 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. 1010 Wisconsin Avenue Associates	To hang cast aluminum letters, measuring 12" high (16½ sq. ft.) ½" projection from brick wall (described in drawings) 13' feet above sidewalk.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	
148	1610 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. In Marrakech LTD	30" x 30" double face wood arm sign on metal bracket.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	
149	1654 31st Street, N.W. Alfred Friendly, St.	Install new bath and kitchenette, pour new topping slab, erect partitions and stair, repair and raise roof, install new doors and windows in existing carriage house.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit.	
150	2810 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Georgetown Plaza Associates by JBG Associates	Sheathe side wall with new brick. Construct three new windows at first floor side elevation to match existing at second floor front elevation. Construct 6'-0" brick wall at edge of abutting plaza, 8'-0" above rear yard, with wood gate to new access stair from plaza to rear yard.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	

26 September 1978

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
-----	-------------------	---------

OG 78-

151	3616 Prospect Street, N.W. Jerry Luss	Rear alteration with balconies.
-----	--	---------------------------------

ACTION: Issue permit.

153	901 34th Street, N.W. Corson and Gruman	Apartment/townhouse Complex.
-----	--	------------------------------

ACTION:

154	1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. Landow & Co.	Commercial Building
-----	--	---------------------

ACTION:

155	3421 Prospect St., N.W. Mr. and Mrs. Davis Morse	Lower two brick piers three courses. Reinstall brick cap. Install two coach lamps, subject to field inspection.
-----	---	--

ACTION: Issue permit.

157	3047 K Street, N.W. Georgetown Inland West Corp.	Raze commercial building.
-----	---	---------------------------

ACTION:

162	1050 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. Premier Charter Corp.	New Office Building Resubmission. Refer to O.G. 78-129.
-----	---	--

ACTION:

163	1312 31st Street, N.W. Hon. William Moorhead	Rebuild porch rail as solid wall; retain existing picket design on exterior wall rail. Replace existing screens with new screen panels.
-----	---	---

ACTION: Issue permit

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

26 September 1978

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	<u>PROJECT</u>
SL 78- 62	2527 Waterside Drive, N.W. S. Shelom Baraves	Attic renovation/dormer addition.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	
75	600 Water Street, S.W. Washington, Channel Ltd. Partnership	Construct a two-story marina control tower.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	
79	303 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E. Madison National Bank	Remove 25 year old canopy and store front applied to much older building and replace with entrance consistent with original facade design.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	
82	411 First Street, S.E. Raymond James Cuervo	Change double hung 9 over 9 window to bay window.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	
152	1445 Whittier Place, N.W. Joseph Ervin	Enclose porch and add deck.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES
26 September, 1978

General Services Administration
J. Edgar Hoover Building

Mr. Dale Thompson

Department of the Navy, Chesapeake
Division, Naval Facilities Engineering
Command

Mr. Scalesca

Department of the Army

Lt. Col. Bob Faxson
Mr. M. Kowalschick

901 34th Street, N.W.

Alan Lockman
Marty Schwartz

1000 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W.

Landow and Company

3047 K Street

Landow and Company

1050 Thomas Jefferson Street

Vlastimil Koubek

Development of 15th St. between F & G

Mr. David Childs

General Service Administration; Public
Building Service, Region 3
White House Solar Heating

Mr. Holcome

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
26 September, 1978

The meeting convened at 10:15 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Members Present: Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Hon. Philip W. Buchen
Hon. Victorine du Pont Homsey
Hon. Frederick D. Nichols
Hon. Kevin Roche

Staff Present: Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary
Mrs. Elizabeth Bemis
Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson
Mrs. Sue A. Kohler
Miss Barbara Tatge

House District Committee
Staff Present:

Mr. Nelson Rimensnyder

Landmarks Committee
Staff Present:

Mrs. Tanya Beauchamp

I. ADMINISTRATION:

A. Dates of next meeting approved as: 24 October, 1978
28 November, 1978

B. Minutes of August 1978 meeting, approved.

C. General Services Administration Master Plan of Federal Triangle, Old Post Office Area, report. The Assistant Secretary told the members that there had been a "ground-breaking" ceremony at the Old Post Office building and work on the interior has begun. He also reported that three architects have been chosen to submit plans for completion of the Federal Triangle.

D. District of Columbia, Proposed Landmarks Legislation, report. The Secretary reported that the Commission had not been successful in incorporating the changes desired in this legislation. The bill still provides for duplicate review by the Commission and the Landmarks Committee, although this provision has been opposed by the American Institute of Architects, the Committee of One Hundred, the Citizens' Association of Georgetown, and other concerned organizations, as well as the Commission of Fine Arts. In response to a question, the members were told that if the legislation is passed by the City Council, it will then go to Congress for review, unless the Council places it in an emergency category. The members were also informed by the Secretary that it is the Justice Department's opinion that the legislation, as written, undermines the authority of a Federal agency.

E. Arlington County Height Limits, report. The Secretary reported that since the last meeting he has attended two more hearings on the granting of permits for three tall buildings in the Rosslyn area. Two of the buildings would be 380 feet above the river; the third, 357 feet twice the height of any existing buildings. All three would be highly visible from the Washington side of the river, particularly from the Capitol-Washington Monument-Lincoln Memorial axis. The Secretary said that the staff of the Arlington County Planning Commission had offered to meet with him to discuss the problem, but he was not hopeful that the permits would be denied as the Arlington County Board was highly unsympathetic to his views.

F. Personnel Announcements: Resignation of Sibley Jennings, Architect; introduction of Elizabeth Bemis, Administrative Assistant.

II. SUBMISSIONS - REVIEWS

A. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

Susan B. Anthony Dollar, revised design. The Secretary introduced Mr. Francis Frere from the Mint who showed two revised designs for the coin. One had been marked with suggestions for refinement (arrived at during a previous meeting with the Chairman, in which the reactions of the Commission at its preceding meeting were conveyed to the artist), and the second showed the result of these changes. The members found the second design much improved and gave it their approval. In answer to a question, Mr. Frere said that form of the eagle on the reverse would be that used for the Apollo space program.

EXHIBIT B

B. General Services Administration

J. Edgar Hoover Building, Proposed Sculpture for Courtyard; design development. The Secretary introduced Mr. Dale Thompson from the F.B.I., who first stated for the members' information that the free standing sculpture for the courtyard would not be brought in for review until November or December. He then presented the proposed design for the bas relief sculpture to be used in conjunction with the inscription on the wall. He explained that the sculptor had used Mr. Hoover's likeness on a medal as a model for this relief. The Chairman expressed the opinion of the Commission that upon enlargement the design had become somewhat crude and was not of the quality needed for such a prominent location. In response to Mr. Thompson's request, the Chairman said he would be happy to work with representatives of the F.B.I. in developing a better design. The submission was not approved.

C. Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Power Plant Fuel Storage Facility, Washington Navy Yard. The Assistant Secretary pointed out the location of the proposed facility

within the Navy Yard--along the Anacostia River in an industrial area, not adjacent to the historic district. He then introduced Mr. Scalesca from the Navy who explained that the facility would take the form of storage tanks, screened by a concrete wall and trees. He showed a rendering of a proposed walk and park area between the river and the storage area which showed the area well-planted with trees and shrubs. He said that the National Capital Planning Commission, in granting its approval, had made the requirement that the large trees immediately in front of the storage tanks be planted at this time, for screening purposes, even though the park itself is scheduled only for future development. On this basis, the members approved the project.

EXHIBIT C

D. Department of the Army

Memorial Plaque, Armed Forces, Vietnam Conflict. The Secretary reminded the members that they had seen this submission previously and had requested the omission of faces from the plaque, limiting it to an inscription only. The new design, submitted by Lt. Colonel Faxon, was considerably altered but still depicted members of the armed forces. Colonel Faxon explained that it was the Army's feeling that viewers would want to see some people on the plaque, not just lettering. The Chairman disagreed, reiterating the Commission's position of the previous meeting, that the inscription could be very moving and the letters well designed, conveying the message with more dignity than could be if a pictorial element were introduced. He suggested that the necessary color and visual interest could be provided in the case below. The project was not approved.

EXHIBIT D

E. D.C. Department of Licenses, Investigations and InspectionsOld Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 78-153, 901 34th Street, N.W., Apartment/Townhouse Complex. The Assistant Secretary told the members that this project was for the Georgetown Waterfront, on 34th Street between K Street and the C & O Canal. It would consist of a seven story apartment building in the center surrounded by townhouses. He noted that because of the grade, the apartment would have the benefit of a very liberal interpretation of the 60 foot height limit. Mr. Wynant Vanderpool of the Georgetown Board said that the Board's reaction had been that the project was not appropriate to Georgetown and that there were too many units. He pointed out that some of the townhouses would literally be underneath the Whitehurst Freeway. Mr. Hoff, representing the ANC, thought the project too massive for the canal area; Mr. Grosvenor Chapman from the Citizens' Association of Georgetown felt that although the concept of placing the townhouses around the large apartment unit had merit, the architecture was not appropriate.

The members all felt that the design had the character of a suburban development and did not belong in Georgetown. Mr. Roche was particularly concerned with the "nervous" stepping of the houses

and with the use of mansard roofs on all the units. The need for a model was stressed, and it was the consensus that the project needed a great deal of study. It was not approved.

2. O.G. 78-154, 1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W., Commercial Building. The Assistant Secretary explained to the members that this project would be located on the Georgetown waterfront, at the northwest corner of Thomas Jefferson and K Streets. It would involve the demolition of a metal shed and two brick buildings as well as the construction of a new commercial building and two townhouses. Mr. Nathan Landow, the developer, and Mr. Ivan Osedoff, the architect were introduced. Mr. Landow said that the new building would be used as a design center and would consist primarily of showroom space. The lower three levels would be glazed to form a garden-like space and would, perhaps, contain a restaurant and showroom. The upper floors would be oriented toward an interior atrium rather than to the Whitehurst Freeway over K Street. He said there would be three levels of parking, and that because of the nature of the building's use it would not bring a great number of people or cars to the area. When asked about the height, he replied that it would be 90 feet above Thomas Jefferson Street and 103 feet above the river. The Chairman commented that the Commission had limited other projects in that area to 60 feet from the street.

The Assistant Secretary introduced Mr. Vanderpool of the Georgetown Board who said that the Board thought the building too high and also questioned the sloping glass on the lower levels, primarily because of the problem of dirt collection. Ms. Grace Lockwood, a landscape architect representing the ANC, objected to the height and the design but liked the low density aspect of this project. Mr. Chapman, representing the Citizens' Association, said the building did not have the proper character for Georgetown. He also commented on the 31st Street townhouses, saying they would look better across the alley rather than next to the commercial structure. Mr. Roche agreed with this, and the Chairman summarized the Commission's and the Board's evaluation by disapproving the design as presented and requesting the developer to lower the height of the building and re-study the design in an attempt to rid it of "commercial blandness". Mr. Landow said he was unwilling to do this, and thanked the Commission for hearing his presentation.

3. O.G. 78-157, 3045 K Street, N.W., raze commercial buildings. The Assistant Secretary explained that these buildings are presently on the site of the project just discussed. One is a metal shed, the other two are attached two story brick structures. The members had no objection to razing the metal shed, but decided to postpone giving permission to raze the brick buildings until further research has been done and they have seen a suitable design for a new structure.

4. O.G. 78-162, 1050 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W., New Office Building - Resubmission. The Assistant Secretary reminded the members that in previous submissions they had questioned the height and massing of this project, and at the last meeting had asked for a study of the sightlines from the C & O Canal to the building. He introduced the

Architect, Mr. Vlastimil Koubek, who showed new elevation studies and pointed out that the building was now identical in height, at the cornice line, to the Foundry development across the street, with the penthouse actually somewhat lower. The apartment house section would be slightly higher, because of the grade, but not quite as high as the Kaufmann-Canal Building across 31st Street. He also produced a drawing with a sightline from across the Canal and said that because of the foliage and the presence of a two story building along the canal, the new building would be scarcely visible. The Chairman remarked that he was still concerned about the view of the apartment building from 31st Street.

Mr. Vanderpool, speaking for the Georgetown Board, said that the Board felt Mr. Koubek had complied with their requests and they were willing to grant approval. Mr. Hoff, the ANC representative, expressed his fear that Thomas Jefferson Street would become a canyon of tall Buildings; Mr. Chapman of the Citizens' Association saw the basic problem as "trying to fit a Leviathan into the Georgetown scene." He was also critical of the strong horizontality of the center part of the main building. Mr. Roche thought the project much improved and did not object to its "quiet" horizontality. In response to Mr. Hoff's comment, he said that it might be preferable to have this building as large and bulky as the Foundry development so that the latter would permit a 90 foot height in this area and that the Commission has been doing everything possible to keep new buildings considerably lower. He and Mr. Roche again expressed their concern over the height of the apartment building. Mr. Koubek suggested that he could perhaps remove the top floor or set it back; the Chairman suggested that he do this and also try to give it a more domestic scale and eliminate the balconies, which are not characteristic of Georgetown. A majority of the members felt that the building would be improved if the one story horizontal band running along the entire length of the Thomas Jefferson Street facade of the main building be further extended. The project was not approved.

5. Appendix 1, approved.

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. Design for Fifteenth Street, N.W., between F and G Streets, N.W., block including Keith's Theater/Albee Building, Metropolitan Bank Building, and Rhodes Tavern. The Secretary introduced architect David Childs from Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, who said that at this time he would like to have a decision regarding the depth of the required setback on 15th Street and an indication of the priorities for the preservation of the historic buildings on the site, now becoming a costly consideration for the developer, Oliver T. Carr and Company.

Mr. Childs discussed the setbacks first, explaining that the 1910 Building Heights Limitation Act permitted a height of 80 feet to the first setback and 95 feet to the top of the building, but did not specify the depth of the setback. He said that his firm was proposing 41 feet, the depth of the Rhodes Tavern lot, as a reasonable figure based on other setbacks in the block and in the surrounding area; the Washington Hotel roof garden, for example, has a setback of 35 feet. Mr. Childs said he considers this depth more an aesthetic than an administrative matter and therefore was bringing it before the Commission for an opinion.

In regard to the preservation of the historic buildings, Mr. Childs noted that the cost for selective demolition of the Keith's/Albee and Metropolitan Bank buildings has risen to approximately six million dollars, close to three times what had been estimated early in the year. In view of this and the unexpectedly strong desire on the part of some citizens groups to preserve the tavern, the developer has said that he will agree to assume only the cost of preserving the Metropolitan Bank building or the Rhodes Tavern. If the tavern is to be saved, the building behind it will have to rise to 130 feet. Mr. Carr has agreed to lease the tavern to the Junior League and let them assume the responsibility of restoring and maintaining it. If Rhodes Tavern is chosen for preservation; Mr. Childs said he would prefer to move it to another part of the site; it is his judgment, however, that the bank building is more worthy of preservation and could be worked into the overall scheme more satisfactorily.

Karen Gordon, the ANC representative, rose to say that she believed Mr. Carr had not received the correct information regarding the proper setback line. She thought any decisions should be delayed until this has been determined as it would, perhaps, make the preservation of the old buildings less expensive than anticipated.

The Chairman summarized his views and those of the other members by telling Mr. Childs, first, that the Commission would approve of his 41 foot setback, as far as aesthetics are concerned. This is the only kind of approval the Commission could give, but if it would help in the interpretation of the law and further the cause of preservation he would be happy to grant it. Secondly, the Chairman said that, again, on aesthetic grounds, the Commission would prefer to see the Metropolitan Bank building saved rather than Rhodes Tavern. On the other hand, he did not feel the Commission could take a stand against the preservation of the tavern if funds could be found for its preservation, recognizing that there was a strong movement to save it for what Mr. Roche characterized as its social, if not architectural, significance. He also said that the Commission continued to be strongly in favor of saving all the Beaux Arts facades. Mrs. Homsey asked to go on record as not supporting the preservation of Rhodes Tavern.

Margaret Hare, representing the Junior League, explained her organization's plans to the members and showed a sketch of the proposed

restoration.

As this submission was for information and guidance only, no formal approval or disapproval was required.

2. Appendix 2, approved.

A. General Services Administration; Public Buildings Service, Region 3

White House Solar Heating Installation Designs. The Secretary introduced Mr. Corcoran of the Department of Energy who explained to the members that these energy saving panels were to be located on the roof of the cabinet room in the west wing. The architect, Ezra Ehrenkrantz, said that their purpose was to supply domestic hot water for that part of the White House. He showed slides to illustrate the visibility of the panels from various points --the Truman balcony, the dining room, rose garden, Washington Monument --and said that he had been very careful to keep them as unobtrusive as possible, to keep the piping out of view and not to make any unnecessary cutting through the building surfaces. The members agreed that the installation would not be detrimental to the appearance of the White House and the project was approved.

EXHIBIT E

The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Signed

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Charles H. Atherton". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Charles H. Atherton, Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN

FREDERICK D. NICHOLS

VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY

KEVIN ROCHE

ELI S. JACOBS

EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

20 October 1978

Dear Chairman Tucker:

I am writing in regard to the "Historic Landmarks and Historic District Protection Act of 1978" which is scheduled for first reading by the D. C. Council at its meeting on October 23, 1978.

The Commission of Fine Arts supports a strong preservation program for the District of Columbia, but we are concerned about certain sections of this legislation that will result in a duplication of architectural review and cause unnecessary delay and expense to citizens wishing to alter property or construct new buildings. As you know, both the Georgetown area and the Shipstead-Luce area of the city are already protected by two Federal statutes under the purview of the Commission. The legislation as currently written would subject all building applications in these two areas to review by an additional historic review agency performing exactly the same function as the Commission of Fine Arts, a procedure we feel is unneeded and wasteful.

It also poses serious legal complications where actions by separate agencies might result in conflicting actions and place the Mayor in a difficult position of having two differing sets of recommendations for the same project. I enclose a letter from the Department of Justice which discusses this problem in more detail.

It is our hope that the objections we raised during the Committee hearings be given further consideration, not only by the members of the Council, but by a larger segment of the community than has been represented at the hearings so far, since this legislation will have far reaching effects on the development of the city and the community at large.

October 20, 1978

2.

I would again like to stress the Commission's enthusiastic support for a strong preservation program within the District of Columbia. To this end, we endorse the establishment of a Review Board strictly answerable to the elected government of the District, such as provided for in this legislation. Through this review board, the lines of authority between what are Federal interests and local interests should be clearly delineated, thus avoiding any overlapping authority which would result in administrative burdens on both the city and the private citizen.

In this view, we are joined by The Citizens Association of Georgetown, The American Institute of Architects, The Committee of 100 and others interested in the orderly development of the city.

We will be happy to meet with you or your staff and discuss this in greater detail.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely yours,



J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Sterling Tucker
Chairman
District Council
District Building
14th and E. Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN

FREDERICK D. NICHOLS

VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY

KEVIN ROCHE

ELI S. JACOBS

EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-366-1066

October 4, 1978

Dear Mrs. Winter:

I was happy to appear before your Committee last Wednesday in support of the "Historic Landmarks and Historic District Protection Act of 1978." I am personally in favor of a strong preservation program for the District of Columbia such as envisioned with the enactment of the proposed legislation.

As you know, however, the Commission of Fine Arts is opposed to certain provisions of the Act which would subject all applications for demolition, alteration and new construction in the Georgetown and Shipstead areas of the Capital to a duplicate review by both the Commission of Fine Arts and an Historic Preservation Review Board appointed by the Mayor.

In our view, not only is this duplication of review unneeded and a burden on the applicant, it also raises legal questions regarding possible dilution of the two federal statutes under which the Commission operates with respect to the architectural review of private property in the District of Columbia.

We have been sufficiently concerned about the latter issue to seek advice from the Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice. I just received their reply, and am enclosing a copy for your attention. Note that they bear out our concerns for the over-lapping authority that would result from the legislation in its present form.

October 4, 1978

2.

I hope we can resolve our differences as soon as possible so that the Commission can fully support this important piece of District of Columbia legislation.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Councilmember Nadine P. Winter
Chairperson
Committee on Housing and Urban
Development
District Building
14th and E Streets, N.W.
Room 121
Washington, D.C. 20004

October 17, 1978

Dear Mr. Frere:

Thank you for your letter enclosing the photos of the plaster casts for the Susan B. Anthony dollar coin which we approved at our meeting on September 26th.

We appreciate the efforts on the part of the Mint staff in working with us on the design of the new coin, Many Thanks!

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Charles H. Atherton".

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Francis B. Frere
Assistant Director for Marketing
and Statistical Services
Department of the Treasury
15th and Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20220

October 10, 1978

Dear Commander Beuby:

The Commission was happy to approve designs for a power plant fuel storage facility for the Washington Navy Yard. During our meeting on September 26, 1978, the members indicated their hope that some of the tree planting shown in the long range park scheme could take place at the time of this construction. We would like to condition our approval on this as a screening technique which is integral to building an industrial facility visible from major public thoroughfares and parklands near the center of Washington.

Sincerely yours,

SIGNED

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

S. C. Beuby
Commander (CEC)
United States Navy
Head, Planning Department
Department of the Navy
Chesapeake Division
Building 57, Washington Navy Yard
Washington, D.C. 20374

October 10, 1978

Dear Colonel Faxon:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed a revised design for a memorial plaque for the Armed Forces of the Vietnam Conflict during its September 26, 1978 meeting. The Commission continues to feel that the literal portrayal of members of the military is less eloquent than the simple text of the proposed statement. Though the restudy showed more restraint than the first submission, we believe our original recommendation will result in a more appropriate design. The display cases below the plaque are better suited for commemorative material, such as battle and campaign ribbons, medals or other citations, and are in character with the other memorials in the Trophy Room.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Colonel Robert M. Faxon
LTC, GS
Military Assistant
Department of the Army
Office of the Secretary
Washington, D.C. 20310

October 10, 1978

Dear Mr. Solomon:

As you know the General Services Administration, together with the National Park Service and the Department of Energy, are installing solar collectors on the roof over the Cabinet Room in the west wing of the White House.

I am happy to report that at our meeting on September 26, 1978 the designs for this installation were approved by the Commission of Fine Arts. While the scope of the system is necessarily limited, it should demonstrate how important a good design is to the application of a solar system on an existing building. The White House installation should be a first rate example.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Jay Solomon
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C. 20405

October 4, 1973

Dear Kevin:

Many thanks for your good letter.

We are hanging in on the 15th Street scene, trying everything to get the two major buildings saved. I luckily had a chance to sit next to the Secretary of HUD recently, and am following up on that score.

At all events, your comments are very well taken, I don't think there's doubt in any of our minds about the priorities of what needs saving in that block.

With all best,

As ever,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Kevin Roche
Kevin Roche, John Dinkeloo and Associates
20 Davis Street
Hamden, Connecticut 06517

cc: CEA

JCB:hg

